

CITY OF HAYWARD AGENDA REPORT

Meeting Date 06/13/02 Agenda Item 2

TO:

Planning Commission

FROM:

Erik J. Pearson, AICP, Associate Planner

SUBJECT:

Text Amendment No. 2002-0241 – Request to Amend the Definition of Hotel to Allow Extended Lodging Facilities with Kitchenettes in Individual Rooms and to Amend the Definition of Motel and Hotel to Limit the Length of Stay-

David Davenport for Extended Stay America (Applicant)

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council:

- 1. Adopt the Negative Declaration prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines; and
- 2. Approve the text amendment subject to the attached findings.

BACKGROUND:

Extended Stay America is interested in building a hotel on the site of the existing vacant movie theater building at Southland Mall. Each of the guest rooms would have a small kitchen as the hotel caters to business travelers staying more than a few days.

DISCUSSION:

The definition of 'hotel' found in the City's Zoning Ordinance does not allow for kitchens in the guest rooms. It reads as follows:

A building where lodging with or without meals is provided to the general public for compensation typically on a nightly basis, and where no provision is made for cooking in any individual guest room or suite, but shall not include institutions where human beings are detained under legal restraint.

The definition was written to prohibit provisions for cooking due to concerns that hotels could evolve into single-room apartment units where the necessary amenities would not be available for permanent residents. Since the current definition was adopted, extended lodging facilities have become increasingly popular among business travelers. This type of hotel may be a great benefit for people working for or with Hayward's businesses on assignments of more than a few

days up to a month. Extended lodging facilities area also convenient for people moving to the area for new jobs until housing can be located.

The proposed definition (Attachment B) allows for kitchens in the rooms while ensuring that the facility would remain a high quality hotel with amenities such as in-room internet service, recreational facilities such as a pool and/or fitness room, and daily housekeeping service. Apartment buildings typically do not offer housekeeping, laundry and ironing services to tenants.

Correspondingly, the definitions of 'motel' and 'hotel' found in the City's Zoning Ordinance do not explicitly limit the length of stay for guests. The definition for 'motel' reads as follows:

A group of attached or detached buildings containing individual sleeping or living units designed for or used temporarily by automobile tourists or transients, with garage attached or parking space conveniently located to each unit.

To prevent motels, hotels and extended lodging facilities from converting to apartment buildings or boarding houses, it is recommended that the definitions incorporate a maximum length of stay of 30 days. In addition, motel and hotel operators are responsible for paying the City's Transient Occupancy Tax for guests staying 30 days or less. The results of a survey about extended lodging facilities with responses from 13 other California cities reveal that it is common to limit the length of stay to 30 days for the same reasons.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

An Initial Study and Negative Declaration have been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines. No significant environmental impacts are expected to result from the text amendment.

PUBLIC NOTICE:

On May 24, 2002, notice that an Environmental Initial Study and Negative Declaration had been prepared was posted in the City Clerk's Office, the Main City Hall bulletin board, and in all City library branches. On May 25, 2002, a Notice of Public Hearing for the Planning Commission meeting was published in the local newspaper, The Daily Review.

CONCLUSION:

The text amendment is a minor change to the Zoning Ordinance that will enable new hotels with appropriate amenities to locate in the City of Hayward. The text amendment does not conflict with adopted policies of the General Plan and all other Sections of the Zoning Ordinance. Staff recommends that the Text Amendment be approved.

Prepared by:

Erik J. Pearson, AICP Associate Planner

Recommended by:

Dyana Anderly, AICP Planning Manager

Attachments:

- A. Findings for Approval
- B. Draft Definition
- C. Draft Negative Declaration and Initial Study

FINDINGS OF APPROVAL

TEXT AMENDMENT NO. 2002-0241 David Davenport for Extended Stay America (Applicant) Change the Definition of 'Hotel' and 'Motel'.

- A. Approval of Text Change Application No. 2002-0241 will not cause a significant impact on the environment as documented in the Initial Study prepared per the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines;
- B. Substantial proof exists that the proposed changes will promote the public health, safety, convenience, and general welfare of the residents of Hayward in that the new definitions will allow new extended lodging facilities to serve business travelers and reserve all lodging facilities for tourism activities, which will, in turn benefit the local business community;
- C. That the proposed change is in conformance with the purposes of this Ordinance and all applicable, officially adopted policies and plans in that the change is minor and does not conflict with any other ordinances or policies;
- D. That streets and public facilities existing or proposed will not be impacted and will continue to be able to serve all structures that would be impacted by adoption of this ordinance; and
- E. That allowing kitchens in individual guest rooms and limiting the length of stay will be compatible with present and potential future uses, and, further, a beneficial effect will be achieved which is not obtainable under existing regulations in that the current definition of 'hotel' does not permit kitchens in individual rooms and the current definitions of 'motel' and 'hotel' do not specifically limit the length of stay.

Proposed Definitions:

<u>HOTEL</u>. A building where lodging with or without meals is provided to the general public for compensation typically on a nightly basis, and where no provision is made for cooking in any individual guest room or suite, and where a maximum continuous length of stay is no longer than 30 days, but shall not include institutions where human beings are detained under legal restraint.

Extended Lodging Facilities, where kitchens, kitchenettes or other cooking facilities may be permitted within individual guest rooms, are allowed in any Zoning District where Hotels are permitted, subject to the following standards:

- 1. Each guestroom shall be provided with voicemail, dataports, desk, color television, alarm clock or wake up service. Irons and ironing boards must also be made available to guests upon request.
- 2. Self-service laundry facilities shall be accessible to all guests.
- 3. Recreational facilities such as a pool, whirlpool/spa and/or fitness room shall be provided.
- 4. A 24-hour per day on-site supervisor shall be provided.
- 5. Housekeeping services including cleaning and linen service shall be offered daily to every guestroom.
- 6. Extended Lodging Facilities cannot be used for long-term occupancy (i.e. apartments, care facilities, boarding houses, etc.). Leases of any duration are prohibited.
- 7. Extended lodging facilities may have a maximum continuous length of stay of 30 days with a 5-day interruption required before commencement of each such subsequent stay.

MOTEL. A group of attached or detached buildings containing individual sleeping or living units designed for or used temporarily by automobile tourists or transients, with garage attached or parking space conveniently located to each unit where a maximum continuous length of stay is no longer than 30 days,



CITY OF HAYWARD NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Notice is hereby given that the City of Hayward finds that could not have a significant effect on the environment as prescribed by the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended will occur for the following proposed project:

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Text Amendment No. 2002-0241 — Request to change the definition of "Hotel" in the Zoning Ordinance to allow extended lodging facilities with kitchenettes in individual rooms and to amend the definition of "Motel" and "Hotel" to limit the length of stay.

II. FINDING PROJECT WILL NOT SIGNIFICANTLY AFFECT ENVIRONMENT:

The proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment.

FINDINGS SUPPORTING DECLARATION:

- 1. The proposed project has been reviewed according to the standards and requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and an Initial Study Environmental Evaluation Checklist has been prepared for the proposed project. The Initial Study has determined that the proposed project could not result in significant effects on the environment.
- 2. The project will not adversely affect any scenic resources.
- 3. The project will not have an adverse effect on agricultural land.
- 4. The project will not result in significant impacts related to changes into air quality.
- 5. The project will not result in significant impacts to biological resources such as wildlife and wetlands.
- 6. The project will not result in significant impacts to cultural resources including historical resources, archaeological resources, paleonotological resources, unique topography or disturb human remains.
- 7. The project will not lead to the exposure of people to hazardous materials.
- 8. The project will meet all water quality standards. Drainage improvements will be made to accommodate runoff.
- 9. The project is consistent with the policies of the City General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance.
- 10. The project could not result in a significant impact to mineral resources.
- 11. The project will not have a noise impact and all interior noise standards as specified in the Noise Element of the General Polices Plan will be met.

- 12. The project will not result in a significant impact to public services.
- 13. The project will not result in significant impacts to traffic or result in changes to traffic patterns or emergency vehicle access.
- 14. The project will not require additional service systems.

I. PERSON WHO PREPARED INITIAL STUDY:

Erik J. Pearson, AICP Associate Planner

Dated: May 6, 2002

II. COPY OF INITIAL STUDY IS ATTACHED

For additional information, please contact the City of Hayward, Planning Division, 777 B Street, Hayward, CA 94541-5007, telephone (510) 583-4210, or e-mail erikp@ci.hayward.ca.us.

DISTRIBUTION/POSTING

- Provide copies to all organizations and individuals requesting it in writing.
- Reference in all public hearing notices to be distributed 20 days in advance of initial public hearing and/or published once in Daily Review 20 days prior to hearing.
- · Project file.
- Post immediately upon receipt at the City Clerk's Office, the Main City Hall bulletin board, and in all City library branches, and do not remove until the date after the public hearing.



DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT Development Review Services Division

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST FORM

Project title:

Text Amendment No. 2002-0241 – Request to Amend the Definition of Hotel to Allow Extended Lodging Facilities with Kitchenettes in Individual Rooms and to Amend the Definition of Motel and Hotel to Limit the Length of Stay

Lead agency name

and address:

City of Hayward, 777 "B" Street, Hayward, CA 94541-5007

Contact persons

and phone numbers:

Erik J. Pearson, Associate Planner (510) 583-4210

Project location:

City-wide

Project sponsor's

name and address:

David Davenport

Extended Stay America

58 Mitchell

San Rafael, CA 94903

General Plan:

NA

Zoning:

NA

Description of project:

Request to change the definition of "Hotel" in the Zoning Ordinance to allow extended lodging facilities with kitchenettes in individual rooms and to amend the definition of "Motel" and "Hotel" to limit

the length of stay

Surrounding land

uses and setting:

NA

Other public agencies whose approval is

required:

None.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

	nvironmental factors checked b apact that is a "Potentially Sign			_		
	Aesthetics		Agriculture Resources		Air Quality	
	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources		Geology/Soils	
	Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Hydrology / Water Quality		Land Use / Planning	
	Mineral Resources		Noise		Population / Housing	
	Public Services		Recreation		Transportation/Traffic	
	Utilities / Service Systems		Mandatory Findings of Signi	ficanc	е	
	CRMINATION: (To be complete basis of this initial evaluation:	-	the Lead Agency)			
\boxtimes	I find that the proposed pro a NEGATIVE DECLARA	•	OULD NOT have a significant will be prepared.	effect	on the environment, and	
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.					
	I find that the proposed particles in ENVIRONMENTAL IMPA		MAY have a significant effect EPORT is required.	et on	the environment, and an	
	significant unless mitigated adequately analyzed in an been addressed by mitigati	l" impo earlier on mea NTAL	MAY have a "potentially sign act on the environment, but a document pursuant to applica asures based on the earlier and IMPACT REPORT is required.	it leas ble lea alysis	t one effect 1) has been gal standards, and 2) has as described on attached	
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.					
Signa	L J. Pranture				<u>ay 6, 2002</u> ate	
Erik J	J. Pearson, AICP Associate Pla	nner		Ci	ty of Hayward	

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. A	ESTHETICS Would the project:				
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				\boxtimes
	Comment: The project will not affect any scenic vista.				
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? <u>Comment:</u> The project will not damage scenic resources.				
c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				\boxtimes
	<u>Comment</u> : The project will not affect the visual character or quality of the City of Hayward.				
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				\boxtimes
	<u>Comment</u> : The project will not create a substantial source of light.				
may Ass Cor	AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to icultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies y refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site essment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of inservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on iculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				
	Comment: The project will not affect farmland.				
<i>b)</i>	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				\boxtimes
	<u>Comment</u> : The project will not affect farmland.				
c)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				
	Comment: The project will not affect farmland.				

		Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
esta cor	AIR QUALITY Where available, the significance criteria ablished by the applicable air quality management or air pollution strol district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Build the project:				
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			\boxtimes	
	<u>Comment</u> : The project may have a positive impact on air quality as guests of a hotel with kitchenettes may generate fewer vehicle trips when not dining out.				
b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				\boxtimes
	<u>Comments</u> : The project will not negatively affect air quality.				
c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				
	<u>Comment</u> : The project will not negatively affect air quality.				
d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? <u>Comment:</u> The project will not negatively affect air quality.				\boxtimes
e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? Comment: The project will not negatively affect air quality.				\boxtimes
IV.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project:				
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
	<u>Comment</u> : The project will not adversely affect biological resources.				
o)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?				
	<u>Comment</u> : The project will not adversely affect biological resources.				
;)	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				
	Comment: The project will not adversely affect biological resources.				

Potentially

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				
	<u>Comment:</u> The project will not adversely affect biological resources.				
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				\boxtimes
	<u>Comment:</u> The project will not adversely affect biological resources.				
f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?				\boxtimes
	<u>Comment</u> : The project will not adversely affect biological resources.				

			Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V.	CUL	TURAL RESOURCES Would the project:				
a)		use a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical ource as defined in §15064.5?				\boxtimes
	<u>Cor</u>	mment: The project will not adversely affect historical resources.				
b)		use a substantial adverse change in the significance of an haeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				\boxtimes
	Co	mment: The project will not adversely affect historical resources.				
c)		ectly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site unique geologic feature?				\boxtimes
	<u>Cor</u>	mment: The project will not adversely affect historical resources.				
d)		turb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal neteries?				\boxtimes
	<u>Cor</u>	mments: The project will not adversely affect historical resources.				
VI.	GE	OLOGY AND SOILS Would the project:				
a)		pose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, luding the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
	i)	Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				\boxtimes
		Comment: The project will not be affected by earthquake faults.				
	ii)	Strong seismic ground shaking? <u>Comment:</u> The project will not be affected by seismic ground shaking.				
	iii)	Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				\boxtimes
		<u>Comment:</u> The project will not be affected by seismic-related ground failure.				
	iv)	Landslides?				\boxtimes
		<u>Comment:</u> The project will not be affected by landslides.				
b)		ult in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? nment: The project will not cause soil erosion.				\boxtimes

		Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				\boxtimes
	<u>Comment</u> : The project will not involve unstable geologic units or soil.				
d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				\boxtimes
	<u>Comment</u> : The project does not involve the construction of a physical project.				
e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?				\boxtimes
	<u>Comment</u> : The project does not involve the construction of a physical project.				
	. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the ject:				
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				
	<u>Comment</u> : The project does not involve the construction of a physical project.				
b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				\boxtimes
	Comment: See VII a.				
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				\boxtimes
	Comment: See VII a.				
d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? Comment: See VII a.				

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				\boxtimes
	<u>Comment</u> : The project does not involve the construction of a physical project.				
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				\boxtimes
	Comment: See VII e.				
f)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? <u>Comment:</u> See VII e.				\boxtimes
g)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				\boxtimes
	Comment: See VII e.				
VII	I. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project:				
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?		П		\boxtimes
	<u>Comment:</u> Any hotels constructed with kitchens in the guest rooms will meet all water quality standards.		· .		
b)	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				
	<u>Comment</u> : Any hotels constructed with kitchens in the guest rooms will be served with water by the City of Hayward. Therefore, water quality standards will not be violated and groundwater supplies will not be depleted. Furthermore, recharge of the groundwater table will not be substantially affected.				
c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				
	<u>Comment</u> : The text amendment will not result in substantial erosion or siltation on-or off-site.				

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impaci
d)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				\boxtimes
	<u>Comment</u> : The project will not affect drainage patterns and will not cause flooding.				
e)	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				\boxtimes
	<u>Comment:</u> The project will not will not have any affect on stormwater drainage.				
f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? Comment: See VIII a.				\boxtimes
g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				\boxtimes
	<u>Comment:</u> The text amendment will not create housing or any structures.				
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				\boxtimes
	Comment: See VIII g.				
i)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				\boxtimes
	Comment: See VIII g.				
j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? <u>Comment:</u> The text amendment does not involve a specific location.				\boxtimes
IX.	LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:				
a)	Physically divide an established community?	П			\boxtimes
	Comment: The project will not result in a physical development.	- Inches	لنبيبا		-
b)	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				
	<u>Comment</u> : The text amendment is consistent with the General Plan.				

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				\boxtimes
	<u>Comment</u> : The project will not result in a physical development.				
X . 3	MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				
	<u>Comment</u> : The project will not affect mineral resources.				
b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				\boxtimes
	Comment: See X a.				
XI.	NOISE - Would the project result in:				
a)	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				\boxtimes
	<u>Comment</u> : The text amendment will produce no noise.				•
1 .\	E				5 7
b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				\bowtie
	Comment: See XI a.				
c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
	Comment: See XI a				
d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				\boxtimes
	Comment: See XI a				
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
	Comment: See IX a.				
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?		. 🔲		
	<u>Comment</u> : The text amendment will not expose people to excessive noise levels.				

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? <u>Comment:</u> See IX a.				\boxtimes
b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? <u>Comment:</u> See IX a.				\boxtimes
<i>b)</i>	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? <u>Comment:</u> See IX a.				\boxtimes
XII	I. PUBLIC SERVICES				
with need of mai	ould the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated in the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, d for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to intain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance ectives for any of the public services:				
a)	Fire protection?				\boxtimes
	<u>Comment</u> : The proposed project will have no effect upon, government services in fire and police protection, maintenance of public facilities, including roads, and in other government services.				
b)	Police protection?				\boxtimes
	Comment: See XIII a.				
c)	Schools? <u>Comment</u> : See XIII a.				\boxtimes
d)	Parks? Comment: See XIII a.				\boxtimes
e)	Other public facilities? <u>Comment:</u> No other public facilities will be significantly impacted.				
XIV	/. RECREATION				
a)	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				
	<u>Comment:</u> The text amendment will have no affect on parks or recreational facilities.				

		Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b)	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? <u>Comment</u> : See XIV a.				\boxtimes
χV	. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project:				
a)	Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?				\boxtimes
	<u>Comment</u> : The text amendment will have no affect on traffic of any kind.				
b)	Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				\boxtimes
	Comment: See XV a.				
c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				\boxtimes
	Comment: See XV a.				
d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				\boxtimes
	Comment: See XV a.				
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access? <u>Comment</u> : The text amendment will not affect emergency access.				
f)	Result in inadequate parking capacity?				\boxtimes
	<u>Comment</u> : The text amendment will not affect parking.				
g)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				
	<u>Comment:</u> The project does not conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation.				
ΧV	I. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project:				
a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				\boxtimes
	Comment: The project will not create wastewater.				

		Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b)	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? Comment: See XVI a.				\boxtimes
c)	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				\boxtimes
	<u>Comment</u> : The project will not affect storm water drainage.				
d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				\boxtimes
	Comment: The project will have no effect on water supplies.				
e)	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				\boxtimes
	Comment: See XVI a.				
f)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				\boxtimes
	Comment: The project will not create solid waste.				
g)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				\boxtimes
	Comment: See XVI f.				
χV	II. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a)	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				
b)	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				
c)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				\boxtimes